

would utilize that grain only as a last resort because of the established higher price set by the program in this bill. The same negative consequences result when Nebraska joins these other states because it would be like the countries that have established a National Grain Price Board. The board would dictate how much the farmer could grow and how much they could sell. Under these circumstances grain trading would practically stop immediately. Millers in the eastern part of the country could ship in grain from Canada on the lakes and by rail during the winter with only a twenty-five cent duty and milling would close down in the middle west. The price of bread, beef and other products would increase drastically. The production of beef and other livestock would quickly move out of the cornbelt and we would suffer those consequences. Farmers would suffer severe financial hardship as they would be forced to pay increasingly higher transportation costs to move grain to more distant markets. The grain marketing system is no longer a state by state business. It is national and international in scope. The effect of this loss of freedom can mean that grain would be held in position longer, would further depress prices even though one is artificially set by this legislation. A better solution would be for farm groups to work with the USDA and the federal government for export expansion and solve the problems with foreign subsidies and tariffs. We are all aware of the 1980 grain embargo. In fact our farmers are still suffering from the consequences of that fiasco. We are still trying to recapture lost world grain markets. I wholeheartedly join Senator Beutler in his effort to IPP 551. I urge that you do also.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Richard Peterson.

SENATOR R. PETERSON: Mr. President and members, I, too, rise to support Senator Beutler's kill motion. This bill would only become operational if enough states passed similar legislation that 60 percent of domestic production of the commodity is covered by laws similar to LB 551. Why? I guess I ask this question, why not wait and see if the 60 percent requirement is met first. Second, why not wait and see if this is a worthy idea based on those states which